

## NEW YORK HERALD.

JAMES GORDON BROWN,  
PROPRIETOR AND EDITOR.

PUBLISHED BY J. W. CONNOR OF HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

VOLUME XLII. No. 56.

AMUSEMENTS THIS EVENING.

BROADWAY THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

SILVER THEATRE. Broadway—HARRIS AND FULTON STS.

va. informs us that the James River, also, is now in navigable order. The steamer Roanoke, from this city, arrived there yesterday morning, to the great joy of the inhabitants.

Accounts from Gonaives, (Hayti, to the last inst., state that Souleouque had disbanded his army, and that the invasion of Dominica had been abandoned. Peace is the rage just now, and the ebony potentate likes to keep in the fashion.

The value of foreign goods imported at the port of Boston during the week ending 22d inst., amounted to \$1,068,295.

The cotton market was unsettled yesterday, on account of the foreign news. The sales were too limited to establish a standard of prices. Flour was dull at Saturday's prices. Inferior brands were neglected, while sales of good to extra qualities were confined to the domestic trade. White Southern corn sold at 75c., and yellow at 73c. Rye sold at \$1.12 on the spot. Pork was in fair demand, with sales on the spot at \$15.87 a cask, closing at the latter figure; and deliverable in August, seller's option, at \$15.50. Sugars were firm, with sales of 700 to 800 lbs., and 400 boxes, at prices stated in another column. Coffee was also firm, with moderate sales. Freight was tolerably active for English ports, at steady rates. To Rotterdam a British vessel was loaded with rye at 11d. Rates to Havre were unchanged.

#### Impending War with England—Habitual Violations of Treaties by Her.

The arrival of the Asia brings us the second edition of the brag and bluff of the London Cabinet and press, touching the enlistment and Central American questions. The latter we regard as the only serious ground of dispute; and in that difference we are clearly right. It is impossible to rise from an examination of this question, as presented by Mr. Buchanan and Lord Clarendon, without the fullest conviction of the justice and necessity of the American construction of the Clayton-Bulwer convention. England is not only in the wrong, but her conduct is marked by a shameless disregard of the common decencies of civilized intercourse. She has raised a question of the purest assumption. The treaty itself should never have been negotiated; but once done it should be executed according to its letter and spirit. It is well, in the existing state of our relations with England, to review our diplomatic history with that country since we entered the family of States.

Since the termination of the Revolutionary war we have negotiated with England conventions and treaties, which have been ratified, as follows:—

Provisional Articles	Nov. 20, 1782
Amity and Commerce	Jan. 20, 1783
Amity, Commerce and Navigation (July)	Nov. 19, 1784
Additional (Commerce)	May 4, 1795
Convention	Jan. 8, 1802
Peace and Amity	Dec. 24, 1811
Commerce	Jan. 1, 1812
Treaty on Award of Emperor of Russia	July 12, 1823
Convention (Commerce)	Aug. 6, 1826
Convention	Sept. 29, 1827
Treaty boundary (Northwestern)	Aug. 20, 1842
Treaty boundary (Oregon)	June 15, 1846
Treaty (Clayton-Bulwer)	April 19, 1850
Reciprocity	Nov. 18, 1850

Including the provisional treaty of November 3, 1782, and the armistice of January following, it will be seen we have concluded with England sixteen conventions, besides some additional and explanatory articles, such as seem now to be demanded by the position of the parties to the Clayton-Bulwer compact. From a careful review of our diplomatic intercourse with our amiable kinsmen, it would appear that the object of negotiations and conventions has been rather to complicate disputes than to settle and adjust them.

The definitive treaty of peace in 1783 undertook to adjust the boundaries of the United States and to arrange conditions of political intercourse between the two countries. There is nothing remarkable in the covenants of that compact—they evince fairness, friendship, and a desire to cultivate relations of amity with us on the part of the British government. We had just emerged from a long war, had fairly shown our ability to maintain an independent government, and fully to resist especially the power of the Mother Country longer to keep us in a state of colonial dependence. It was, therefore, both natural and equitable, in arranging terms of accommodation with us, that our progenitors should exercise a due share of magnanimity and seeming liberality; and we can refer to the instrument itself to prove that they did both. The conditions of settlement were few and obvious—that referring to the boundaries of the new government being, in the nature of things, the most difficult. Certain rights appertaining to the fisheries were conceded to the inhabitants of the States, indicating on the part of the British Cabinet extreme moderation, if not liberality. We secured the right of fishing on the Grand Bank and the Banks of Newfoundland, in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, "and all other places in the sea;" and also on all the coasts, bays and creeks of all his Britannic Majesty's dominions in America." This is sufficiently definite and obvious, leaving no earthly room for doubt as to what was intended to be conveyed. It was the broadest and most direct conveyance of authority to the people of the United States to fish "on all the coasts, bays and creeks" of the English possessions on this side of the water. Under this authority we entered the waters in question, and by the enterprise of our people soon established a most important and lucrative branch of American commerce; and according to the treaty of 1815, the United States were to remain in complete possession of their rights in regard to their intercourse with British North America. No sooner, however, had the fisheries become a source of profit, and were sure to be a nursery of American seamen, than we were met by the British Cabinet with all sorts of limitations and restrictions of our rights, and often their practical denial, by the interference of the colonial authorities, under the direction of the home government.

The treaty of 1794 had been negotiated by which commercial privileges were liberally conveyed to Great Britain, and certain general rights guaranteed to the people of the United States, and amongst these, of course, the rights appertaining to the Fisheries. Meanwhile England was engaged in the Napoleonic wars, and in 1806 issued her Orders in Council which were followed by the Berlin and Milan decrees of Napoleon. It is enough to say that in the meanwhile not the slightest regard was paid by our kinsmen either to the obligations of their treaties or to the laws of nations. The Fisheries had proved to be a most valuable nursery for our seamen, and this, with other selfish considerations, was enough to induce the government to practically deny us the rights they had conveyed by the treaty of 1793. Impressment of our seamen, to the number of several thousand followed, and our commerce was the object of piracy in all parts of the world. The embargo followed, non-intercourse and war came in its

train; and three years after, peace was agreed upon, totally ignoring the causes which led to hostilities. We backed out, and never, officially, till 1842, was the chief ground of complaint, that of impressment, alluded to, and then Lord Ashburton informed Mr. Webster that he had no powers under which he could negotiate on the subject.

Thus, the fishery article in the treaty of peace has been made a source of almost endless international wrangling. In vain did we point to the terms of the treaty; we were not then a strong Power—we had waged war with our adversary and withdrew from it without redressing the grievances we complained of. It was, therefore, impossible to secure justice, and absurd to hope for an enforcement of the compact. In 1818 Mr. Gallatin and Mr. Rush negotiated another treaty, embracing the fishery dispute. It is manifest, from the terms of this latter convention, that our public men had come to the conclusion that we had better take a half loaf; so the general rights conveyed by the convention at Paris were vastly reduced and confined to specific districts, and these were subsequently diluted by the British government, by insisting that we should be confined to certain lines to be drawn from "headland to headland." The language of this construction contrasts strangely with the "coasts, bays and creeks" of the first treaty, which smack strongly of near shore description. But we yielded—precisely because we could do no better. It was all we could get, and all we have ever succeeded in getting, excepting a treaty now and then which has invariably cut down our rights.

We have been equally and even more unfortunate in our intercourse with England touching the boundaries of the Union. The original convention on this subject was again all well enough. It was not exactly definite, but undertaken evidently to be fair. In process of time, however, under the rapid progress of this country, and the development of valuable points here and there, it became manifest that something could be gained by crowding us off from this and that degree of latitude or longitude; hence our boundary disputes were prolonged from 1783 to 1846, a period of more than sixty years, and ended at last by the loss of about three hundred miles of territory on the Pacific ocean, and extending in something of a wedge-like form into the interior; and we were equally unfortunate, though on a smaller scale, in the settlement of the Northeastern limits of the Union. A candid and fair construction of the treaty of 1783, and that of 1814—the latter explanatory, giving "metes and bounds" touching the question of boundary—was all that we required to entitle us to all we claimed in the Northeast and the Northwest; and that was precisely what was denied us. The ink was hardly dry that legalized the last named convention before the London Cabinet set up a construction, touching the Oregon boundary, wholly incompatible with its covenants.

Four years afterward that construction became the basis of another negotiation, and the United States so far yielded as to agree to a joint occupation of the disputed territory for ten years, and in 1828 extended this agreement for ten years more, and until certain notice should be given. When this notice was finally served, and the joint occupation terminated, we had the satisfaction of having these two treaties quoted by the British government as one of the grounds upon which it claimed title. It is needless to say, when the question came up for final adjustment we backed down from 54 degrees 40 minutes to the 49th parallel of latitude, and put our antagonist into possession of territory we had clearly acquired by treaty with Spain and by discovery. The Oregon treaty of 1846 contains the terms of this capitulation. We not only surrendered our territorial rights in that treaty, but conceded to the Hudson's Bay Company what we are now talking of buying for over a million of dollars.

Thus our boundary differences, extending through sixty-three years of negotiation, gave birth to six distinct treaties on the subject, neither of which was ever honestly executed, possibly excepting the last, and of that we ought not to feel over confident. It is certainly worthy of note that England is the only Power with which we have had these endless boundary and intercourse disputes. Our relations with all other States have been cordial, friendly, and easily managed.

The very covenant of the first treaty of peace, to withdraw the British armies from our territory, and to surrender up places and things, and not to "carry away any negroes or other property belonging to the inhabitants of America," was not noticed at all till the conclusion of the convention of 1794, and then shamefully violated in both provisions, the subject matter of the latter of which was referred to the Emperor of Russia, and finally disposed of in 1822. It is worthy of remark that even after the award of the umpire had been given, the British Cabinet, true to its instincts, quibbled about the construction of that award, and compelled the referee, out of regard to his own position, to re-affirm his decision.

The treaty of 1794, negotiated by Mr. Jay, was an unmixt blunder. So far as questions of previous dispute were involved, they were actually made worse; while its article in reference to the trade of the British West India and the United States, was a palpable discrimination in favor of British navigation. It required more than thirty years to get rid of this nightmare upon American trade and commerce. It was deemed extraordinary and unaccountable that the British government refused to withdraw its troops and deliver up forts and places occupied by them for so long a period after the conclusion of peace; but subsequent events have gone far to indicate that such refusal was matter of State policy, looking to further concessions from this government; and at the very moment that the Ashburton treaty (1842) was being negotiated, the five great Powers of Europe were concocting a league to control the freedom of the seas, and the American negotiator, in the face of that combination, was made to guarantee concurrent naval operations with England on the coast of Africa. That negotiation was a "family matter," and as usual, the offspring was put into subjection to the progenitor.

The next point to be noticed is the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. What that convention was made for, what we were to gain by it which we did not before possess, even upon our own construction of its terms, it is not easy to see. We had avowed certain purposes in reference to European colonization on this continent, and we made a treaty with England in reference to the operations of that Power in Cen-

tral America. The intention of this government in executing the convention was to foreclose England in that direction; the result has turned up that by its terms she claims permanent lodgment there. What else Mr. Clayton thought of we know not; but certain it is, if he was at all conversant with the treaties of 1794, 1798, 1802, 1814, 1815, 1818, 1822, 1826, 1827, 1842 and 1846, and the various intermediate constructions put upon them by the British government, and not one of which has been executed in a spirit of fairness, he is little less than a stupid diplomatic blunderer, better fitted to manage the small concerns of his small State than the foreign affairs of the American people.

We do not complain of England for driving good bargains with our inexperienced diplomatists; but having the advantage in the trade, it is beneath the character of a common highwayman to cheat in the distribution. The truth is, the lesson which this review of our affairs teaches is that our great progenitor is a most slippery customer. Where he has the power it is evident that it is quite sufficient for his purposes. In this light we can see his present bluster, and better understand the motive of that infinitely contemptible manoeuvre to frighten the American government from its position in reference to Central American affairs.

It remains to be shown that the present is much the most important controversy we have ever had with England. We cannot recede from our position without a sacrifice of honor, safety and interest alike. Every movement of population, every sign of enterprise which comes to us from the Pacific Ocean—from California, Japan and China—from mountain and from valley—from city and from country—foretells us of the future value and importance of Central America. England sees this, and it is this fact that has made her stubbornly insist upon making a lodgment in that direction. We are continental neighbors, friends, projectors and proprietors on both oceans, and at the hazard of war, should stand by our position. We have a military power great enough to control affairs on this side of the water; it is our interest, and our duty, and our determination, war or no war, to do so.

The present bluster of our kinsman, although extremely harmless and useless so far as we are concerned, may operate better upon the governments of the Continent. The announcement that Alexander of Russia and Francis Joseph of Austria will be present at the Peace Congress at Paris gives a decidedly continental aspect to that movement; and if we denominated the present warlike tone of the London Cabinet towards the United States as an effort to show to the Paris negotiators that England is all powerful and exhaustless in resources, we have no doubt future events will wholly justify us.

THE COST OF CLEANING THE STREETS AND THEIR CONDITION—WHAT BROADWAY CAN BE CLEANED FOR.—As the city authorities have failed in their duty to clean the streets of New York properly, a number of merchants and hotel proprietors, with a very commendable public spirit, have taken the matter into their own hands, and are cleaning the front of their residences and places of business. Yesterday groups of laborers were employed in different parts of Broadway in tearing down the Alpine ridges of ice and dirt with which that busy thoroughfare is now incumbered; and if this good example is generally followed, we may hope to see, before the week is over, the main artery of our city travel in a condition that at least is not particularly disgraceful to our metropolis.

From the parties interested we learn the following facts with reference to the cost of cleaning different portions of Broadway:—

For cleaning block between Chambers and Reade streets	\$100 00
Do. do. Leonard and Franklin streets	60 00
Do. front of St. Nicholas Hotel	300 00
Total for three blocks	\$460 00

As there are about 40 blocks between the Battery and Grace church, at this rate it would cost about \$6,000 to clean Broadway between those two points; and a number of contractors have expressed a willingness to remove the dirt and clean the street for three-fourths of a cent per square foot.

This sum may appear large, but surely double the sum would be trifling compared with the destruction of property, inconvenience to business, and annoyance to which our citizens are put by the present condition of this great centre of city trade and travel. And the conduct of Commissioner Ebling cannot be too severely reprobated for not having the unsightly ridge which he has raised, to disgrace our city, removed long ere this.

He cannot complain of not having means, for the Comptroller's report shows that the people are munificent in their outlays of money, though the use to which it has been put is enveloped in considerable mystery. According to the books in the Comptroller's office, there was paid out for cleaning the streets of New York, from January 1st to October 29th, 1855, the sum of \$27,262 42, and the probable expense for the other two months was about \$60,000—in all, nearly \$340,000. We cannot state the exact amount, from the fact that the books in the Comptroller's office, through some strange remissness on the part of Mr. Flagg, are not yet written up.

The original estimate, in the tax levy, for cleaning the streets for the year 1855 was \$170,000, and this sum was afterwards swelled by an appropriation of \$90,000 by the Common Council, to \$260,000; and again, by a further appropriation, to \$277,784. But even this vast sum was insufficient to meet the demands of the head of the street cleaning department. The estimate put in the tax levy for the year 1856 for cleaning the streets is \$259,224; but this sum will fall far short, if Commissioner Ebling continues to call for as much money and do as little with it as he did last year.

These facts speak for themselves. Our citizens are taxed \$300,000 a year for cleaning our streets, and yet so inefficient are the parties whose business it is to keep our thoroughfares in proper order, that they are compelled to put their hands in their pockets and have done by private enterprise what it is the function of the city government to see performed.

For this state of things there is no justification. New York is built on a long, narrow strip of land, with a rapid river flowing on either side; and with a good system of sewerage, such as we have, and with a competent person at the head of the street cleaning department, this city could be kept as pure and

sweet as any in the world, and at less expense, than its greater advantage of position.

We call upon our citizens to make some demonstration to wake up our officials to a sense of their duties, so that the stain may be removed from New York of being the filthiest city in the Union, out of New Jersey.

#### The Philadelphia Know Nothing Convention and its Interesting Results.

From the rest and soothing reflections of the Sabbath, we had supposed—we had hoped, we may say—that the members of the Philadelphia Nominating National Know Nothing Convention would on Monday morning reassemble in council, united like a band of brothers, recognizing "no North, no South, no East, no West"—no niggers—no Nigger Worshipers—nothing in short but the Union, the constitution, and the most available candidate for the impending contest for the spoils of seventy-five millions a year. But our hopes were speedily dashed. The re-assembling of the brethren yesterday, soon disclosed the fact that the repose of the Sabbath day had done them very little good—that with a considerable number of the delegates there could be no such thing as the "pretermittin'" of the nigger question—and that they were prepared to desert "Sam" for "Sambo," upon the first provocation in the shape of what they call a "Southern slaveocrat" or a "Northern dough-face."

Through the intrepidity of Parson Brownlow, of Tennessee, these Northern impracticables were speedily brought to the test. The Convention, upon the redoubtable parson's motion, resolved—1st to 51—to proceed to the nomination of their Presidential ticket. The excitement, of course, was tremendous; but the first ballot was the additional feather that broke the camel's back. Here it is:—

Fillmore	71	Houston	6
Law	27	Bell	5
Garret Davis	13	Brooks	3
Judge McLean	7	Raynor	2
Stockton	8	Campbell of Ohio	1
Clayton	1	Johnson	1

Total

Upon this splendid beginning for the resurrection of the dead body of the old whig party the Convention took a recess. But mark the upshot of this experiment—some "fifty ultra Northern members bolted," and set up a second bolters' convention, with Lieutenant Governor Ford, of Ohio, at their head—one of the leaders of the bolting party of last June. He and his abolitionist brethren bolted then because of that "twelfth section;" but now, that scarecrow having been taken down, they take to their heels at the first tap of the drum for Millard Fillmore. Anything but Fillmore! He signed the Fugitive Slave law—did all that he could as President to break down W. H. Seward and his schemers, and made himself altogether too popular with Southern whig slaveholders to suit such inflammable Seward Know Nothings as Col. Ford, of Ohio, and his followers.

Read the proceedings of Col. Ford's bolters' convention. They were ready to unite with any party for freedom that would not reject them on account of "their American principles." Their line of action, then, is plain enough. Seward and his party will accept them on those terms. They were prepared to make freedom the paramount question. They believe that the Pope is undermining our institutions—that the Jesuits are at work among us—that the Irish Catholics are their instruments, and that unless they are put down, Popery will ultimately rise upon the ruins of our glorious republic. But this Ford party, while believing all this, still more strongly believe that freedom—nigger freedom—is the "paramount question." What a precious set, to be sure, are these Ford philosophers for carrying out that great fundamental idea that "Americans (excluding the Irish and including the niggers) shall rule America!"

That first ballot was like the opening of an immense mine of hidden treasures, old and new; but the ominous ascendancy of Fillmore, a live old straight whig, was the signal for the bolt and the indignation, the consternation, and all the interesting scenes which ensued in both divisions of the Happy Family. There has been nothing of the kind in any national convention of any party to compare with this Ford split, neither before nor since the exit of the Van Buren delegates, full of rebellion and disasters, from the convention which nominated Gen. Cass. There were "courses, not loud, but deep," by the Webster men at Baltimore when General Scott was nominated; and there were plentiful symptoms of "open treason" at Philadelphia against that slaughter house nomination of General Taylor; but the Van Buren split of 1848 is the only thing in our political history which, from the beginning to the end, is analogous to this Ford bolt from the national Know Nothing camp; for the one and the other rest exclusively upon the "paramount question of nigger freedom."

"Like causes produce like effects"—old, but apropos. In 1848 the democratic party was grounded upon this "paramount question of nigger freedom;" in 1852 the late great whig party was shattered into fragments among the same breakers; and the prospect now is vividly presented of the utter destruction of this new American party, upon the same perilous shoals, in its first attempt to put to sea.

The regular Know Nothings, as will be seen by our telegraphic reports, have placed in nomination Millard Fillmore and Andrew Jackson Donelson. These names are very suggestive, and the subject will receive attention from us hereafter.

#### OUR DIFFICULTIES WITH ENGLAND—THE FEELING AT THE OTHER SIDE OF THE WATER.

We publish to-day two remarkable and interesting documents—one a history of the Central American question, taken from the London Times of January 31, and the other a history of "Recruiting in the United States," which has been published in London in pamphlet form, and which has attracted a good deal of attention. The value of the Times' article is derived from the clear analysis which it presents of the views and arguments of the English government on the construction of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. It will save those who wish to understand the merits of the question without wading through a mass of official correspondence, some trouble. Better still, it will leave the impression on the mind of the reader that, notwithstanding the thoroughly partisan view which it takes, the writer is conscious of the weakness of his case. From this it is evident that the Central American question will never be entered to become a *casus belli* between the two countries.

The history of "recruiting in the United States" gives us the English popular view of the difficulty, as contra-distinguished from

that of Lord Clarendon. It is an ably written and powerful